DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 695 EC 122 858

AUTHOR Anderson, Frances E.: McAnally, Pat
TITLE Art for the Handicapped: Final Report, May, 1978 through July, 1979.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Univ., Normal.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO 451AH80660
PUB DATE 79
GRANT G007801463
NOTE 39p.; Print may be variable on some pages

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Activities; *Art Education; *Art Teachers; Conceptual Schemes; Dance; Drama; *Handicapped Children; *Inservice Teacher Education; Models; Music; Program Descriptions; *Special Education Teachers; *Teacher Workshops; Theater Arts
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois State University

ABSTRACT

The report describes an Illinois State University project for special education teachers and art teachers, which focused on arts programs for handicapped children. Project goals were to familiarize participants with basic characteristics of children with different handicaps, to facilitate communication between art and special education teachers, to familiarize participants with effective art education methods, to increase first hand knowledge of art activities appropriate for handicapped children, to emphasize the importance of the arts as a learning facilitator, and to develop a model for use in the training of special education and art teachers in all areas of the arts (music, drama, dance/movement, and visual arts). The project consisted of a series of workshops involving multimedia presentations, discussions, and other activities. (DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181695

ART FOR THE HANDICAPPED:FINAL REPORT

BY

FRANCES E. ANDERSON,ED.D.,ATR

PROFESSOR OF ART

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY
NORMAL,IL. 61761

Grant Number:G007801463
Project Number: 451AH80660
Length of Project: May,1978-July,1979
Principal Investigators: Frances E.Anderson
Pat McAnally

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Frances E. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC 132858

ART FOR THE HANDICAPPED : Final Report by Frances E.Anderson,Ed.D.,ATR,Professor of Art, Illinois State University,Normal,Il. 61761

Grant Number: G007801463 Project Number: 451AH80660
Project Directors: James E. Walker and Fred V. Mills
Principal Investigators: Frances E. Anderson and Pat McAnally
Length of Project: May 1978 - July 1979

I. Introduction

To comply with Public Law 94-142 and other federal/state mandates the placement of special children in least restrictive environments is becoming a reality in many schools. One of the areas in which "regular" placement often occurs first is in the area of the arts. Included "in the arts" are visual art, music, drama, and dance/movement (physical education).

Public Law 94-142 mandates that in-service preparation of education personnel working with handicapped children become an ongoing function in all states. Currently, few art teachers have been prepared to work effectively with handicapped children that they now have in their classes (Anderson, 1978). They are not familiar with current educational methods necessary to instruct the handicapped child (Anderson, 1976). Many arts teachers do not know or fully comprehend the terminology of special education; thus there may exist a communication barrier between the arts teacher and the classroom teacher...the result has been a less than satisfactory situation for the "mainstreamed" handicapped child in that it is difficult for arts persons to understand special children because of their knowledge gap in special education (Rubin, 1975; Anderson, 1978).

This project is based on the philosophy that special children should be educated to their fullest potential. Every tool and method that can be utilized must be. The arts are also powerful educational tools. Special education teachers often are not fully aware of the tremendous potential of arts experiences to facilitate learning in the academic subjects. The arts can be utilized in the best sense to motivate the special child, to clarify academic concepts and to reinforce concepts and skills which the handicapped child is learning throughout the school day (Anderson and Barnfield, 1974; Anderson, 1975; Williams, 1977; Quinn and Hanks, 1977). It was the intent of this project to join both special education classroom teachers and the arts teachers for the purposes of facilitating communication between groups. Further, the project staff intended to re-educate both groups to achieve the end goal of developing more effective arts programs for handicapped children and more effective and motivating academic programs.

II. Goals

Based on these needs, the project responded to six principle goals:

1. To familiarize participants with basic characteristics of children with different handicaps.
2. To facilitate communication between arts teachers and special education teachers.

3. To familiarize the participants with education methods necessary for effective experiences in the art situations.
4. To increase participants' first-hand knowledge of art activities most appropriate for primary and intermediate learners with a variety of handicapping conditions.
5. To emphasize the importance of the arts as a learning facilitator.
6. To develop a model for use in the training of special education and special teachers in all other areas of the arts (music, drama and dance/movement as well as visual art). (Note: as originally submitted, this project was for a three year period and proposed training in each of the arts. However, the project was funded only for the first year, during which the focus was on the visual arts.)

III. Objectives

When interpreted in the form of measurable objectives, the six primary project goals provided the direction for project activities and evaluation. The specific outcomes to be derived from this project were:

A. To familiarize participants with basic characteristics of children with different handicaps.

1. Given information on the characteristics of children with various handicapping conditions and given case studies of children manifesting these various handicapping conditions, the participant will correctly identify the child as having: hearing impairments, visual impairments, mental retardation, orthopedic handicaps, learning disorders and/or behavioral disorders.

2. Given the label of a particular handicapping condition, the participant will orally list at least 3 characteristics of this handicap and 2 major educational implications for children with this handicapping condition.

B. To facilitate communication between art teachers and special education teachers.

1. Given an open discussion in a guided setting, the art teachers and classroom teachers will discuss common issues, present possible solutions and alternative ways of handling specific situations and alternative ways of handling specific situations and learning problems of handicapped children.

2. Given a list of terms common to special education, the art teacher will write and/or verbally define accurately those terms with which he/she is familiar, and during discussion will ask individual special education teachers for definitions of terms with which he/she is not familiar.

3. Given a list of terms common to the art field, the special education teacher will write accurate definitions for those terms with which he/she is familiar and during discussion will ask individual art teachers for definitions of terms with which he/she is not familiar.

C. To familiarize the participants with educational methods necessary for effective experiences in the art situation.

1. Given information on educational methods for various handicapping conditions and given at least three of the major categories of impairment, the art teacher will demonstrate his/her understanding of the abilities and limitations of the impaired student by planning and adapting at least one art activity per child. The art teacher will orally explain appropriate shifts in motivation and/or art media in concert with a classroom teacher.

2. Given a field assignment, the art teacher will present an art experience to a group containing a proportion of handicapped children. (He/She will designate appropriate materials and demonstrate any adaptations necessary for the handicapped children. The success of the experience will be determined by the teacher's and the child's attitudes toward the experience and toward the end product as reported by the teacher to the third party evaluator, and the teacher's expressed attitudes and feelings as determined by the third party evaluator.)

D & E. To increase participants' first-hand knowledge of art activities; and to emphasize the importance of art as a learning facilitator.

1. Given slide demonstrations of ways in which art can be integrated with academic subjects including math, reading, science and social studies, the participants will outline specific procedures for using art activities as learning facilitators.

2. Using this list of procedures for incorporating art with academic subjects, the participants will present their activities to the group and make modifications or additions based on suggestions.

3. Given media for completion of specific activities the participants will demonstrate three planned art activities showing skill in working/using unfamiliar art media.

4. Given a group discussion situation, the participants will describe their experience with two or more skills they have acquired from working with the unfamiliar art media.

5. Given a group discussion situation, the participants will describe two or more potential classroom problem areas which might occur when working with the art media.

F. To develop a model for use in the training of special education and special teachers in all areas of the arts (music, drama, and dance/movement as well as art).

1. Given evaluation information on the first year's workshop series (teachers' responses to questionnaires, project staff input and consultation from specialists in the other arts areas), a similar series of workshops will be planned and funding requested using this initial Art for the Handicapped model. The second year series will be addressed to the topic: "Art and Music for the Handicapped". The third year a workshop series will be addressed

to the topics of "Drama/Dance/Movement for the Handicapped" and "Interrelated Arts for the Handicapped". (Note: this grant proposal was submitted to BEH, October 1979, and funding awarded for 1979-1980 only.)

IV. Project Procedures

A. Development

1. Staff. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the project it was necessary to have representative staff in the areas of art for the handicapped, handicapped children's learning characteristics and developmental programming in public education settings.

The project was directed by Dr. James E. Walker, Chairman of the Illinois State University (ISU) Department of Specialized Educational Development (SED) and Dr. Fred V. Mills, Chairman of the ISU Art Department. The Principal Investigators were Dr. Frances E. Anderson, Professor of Art, and Mrs. Pat McAnally, Assistant Professor of Special Education.

Dr. Anderson was selected because of her international reputation in the area of Art for the Handicapped. She has published over 20 articles in professional juried publications. Additionally, her book Art for All the Children: A Creative Sourcebook for the Impaired Child (Thomas, Springfield, 1978) has made a significant contribution to the field and is currently being used in over a dozen university training programs. Dr. Anderson is a founding member of both the American Art Therapy Association and the Illinois Art Therapy Association. She is a Registered Art Therapist and has had experience with a variety of handicapped children. This experience has been on-going and in addition to her work at the ISU Laboratory School she established an art program for residents at the Fox Children's Developmental Center in Dwight, Illinois and has consulted on art programs for the Baby Fold, the MARC Center, and Raymond School in Bloomington, Illinois. A frequent presenter at conferences, this past year she made major presentations at: International Society for Education Through Art, Adelaide, Australia, August 1978; National Art Education Association Meeting, San Francisco, April, 1979; Missouri Art Educators Conference (keynote address), May, 1979; Illinois Art Therapy Association, May, 1979.

Mrs. Pat McAnally was selected because of her experience with a variety of handicapped children, her background and expertise in special education in general, and her specialization in the area of the hearing impaired. Mrs. McAnally has been and is very active in professional organizations and is currently serving as President of the Illinois Teachers of the Hearing Impaired. She is an experienced teacher and committed professional with important statewide contacts essential for the success of this project.

In addition to the Principal Investigators, the instructional staff included a doctoral student in Art, Mr. Jose Colchado. Mr. Colchado was selected because of his maturity and prior teaching experience.

He has had over five years experience teaching and developing art programs for minority and culturally disadvantaged persons from 8 years to over 60 years of age. For the past six years he was in charge of arts programming and Assistant Director of the El Paso, Texas, Parks and Recreation Department.

2. Needs Assessment. In conjunction with consultants in the Art and SED Departments, a needs assessment instrument (See Appendix) was developed. Based on research with a variety of handicapped children, decisions were made as to those art activities most appropriate for use with this clientele at the elementary level. Additionally, those special education terms most often used in relation to handicapped children at this level were listed for inclusion in the needs assessment. If the art activities to be taught were to be viable for use by the participants in the public school programs, it was also necessary to determine if the needed art materials would be readily available at their schools. Therefore, a list of art materials was included in the instrument. Finally, since the instructional activities were to focus on ways of integrating art into the remainder of the curriculum, it was important to determine to what extent, if any, teachers were already teaching in an integrated mode. Questions were also included to determine the problems teachers were having in teaching children with specific handicapping conditions. Those problems most frequently occurring would serve as the basis for workshop instruction.

The needs assessment, therefore, covered the following areas:

a. Knowledge of art processes most appropriate at the elementary and intermediate levels.
b. Perceived appropriateness in these art processes to the participant's classroom curriculum.
c. Knowledge of special education terminology.
d. Problems encountered in teaching art to "mainstreamed" handicapped learners and problems encountered in teaching art to learners with specific handicapping conditions.
e. Support for and acceptance of the placement of handicapped children in a regular classroom.
f. Experience with teaching handicapped children.
g. Frequency of integrating art with the academic areas of reading, math, science and social studies.
h. Art materials available to the teachers.

Outcomes. The needs assessment, with a total possible score of 112 for knowledge of art processes, 112 for perceived value in the curriculum and 152 for knowledge of special education terminology, was sent to potential candidates for the workshop. One hundred and twenty-five needs assessments were returned. The scores varied greatly at the different sites (see Table 1); clearly the needs assessment supported the appropriateness of the workshop and the content initially proposed for inclusion.

TABLE 1

NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESULTS BY SITE

Site	Special Ed. Terms (Max. score = 152) Mean Score	Art Processes (Max. score = 112) Mean Score	Value in Curriculum (Max. score = 112) Mean Score
Chicago - n=27	96.60	61.40	61.40
East St. Louis - n=23	83.52	43.66	58.85
Springfield - n=37	102.03	63.66	64.73
Peoria - n=38	90.56	55.70	62.90

In response to questions regarding the most pressing problem teachers were having in teaching art to handicapped children, the participants' responses fell most frequently in the following three categories:

a. Basic problems with children lacking motor skills (scissors skills were most often cited). Having a wide range of motor abilities represented in the same class made it difficult to plan art activities which would hold interest and in which all students could participate (n=16).
b. The need to individualize instruction. The lack of time, manpower and expertise were all cited as contributing factors (n=10).
c. The lack of teacher knowledge of art and art skills (n=10).

When all responses were totalled for the first, second and third most pressing problems, the most frequently cited problems (problems they cited as number 1, 2 or 3) fell into the following categories: children with motor skills remained the most frequently cited problem, with scissors skills most often cited (n=31). The following four categories were cited with equal frequency:

a. Teachers' lack of knowledge about art (n=20).
b. Short "attention span" of children (n=20).
c. Problems in being unable to individualize instruction for children with specific problems (n=20).
d. Problems in communication with students some of whom had difficulty following directions and comprehending the task or activity to be completed (n=20).

The next two problem categories, cited with equal frequency, were:

a. Problems with classroom management, especially with hyperactive and outspoken children (n=12).
b. Problems with motivating students to begin an art project or to stay with the project until it was complete (n=12).

Most teachers indicated that they did have access to the art materials listed on the needs assessment. This positive response suggested that the art activities planned for the workshop were ones that would be feasible for use in each of the participating teacher's classrooms. In other words, needed art materials were readily accessible to the participants; the "lack of proper materials" would not be an issue hindering implementation of the workshop content.

The participants' responses to questions about the frequency of integrating art with social studies, science, math and reading is summarized in Table II (see next page).

All of the participants did not respond to this section of the needs assessment. Additionally, some teachers responded with comments suggesting that they did not consider such integration a part of their teaching responsibilities. Comments such as "I teach art full time", or "I do not teach math or reading", reflected this perspective. It is of interest that a large number of teachers had not considered integrating art with social studies (n=15), math (n=21), science (n=17), or reading (n=17). The most frequently reported integration was with social studies (n=60). Math integrations were second in reported frequency (n=56).

3. Instructional Materials Development. Based on the responses to the needs assessment, four instructional modules on artistic processes were developed. Accompanying instructional slides, a super-8 film and handouts were developed or modified for use on the project. Permission to use the instructional manuel, Activities in Art, by Jose Colchado, was obtained. Additionally, instructional handouts were adapted from chapters in the book, Art for All the Children: A Creative Sourcebook for the Impaired Child, by Frances E. Anderson. Permission to use this material was obtained from the publisher. These materials were adapted to cover the instructional segments in the areas of art and math, reading, science and social studies as well as information on techniques of adapting art materials and activities for use with children having a variety of handicapping conditions. A videotape was made of children with various handicapping conditions in class situations. This videotape was supplemented by a handout covering definitions, characteristics, educational implications and bibliographical references on each handicapping condition. Additionally, a segment covering selected problems in classroom management was prepared using case studies as a departure point for small group discussion.

Selected models of field reports were developed and permission was obtained to reproduce examples from the publication Art for the Handicapped, Why?, produced by the National Committee * Arts for the Handicapped (NC*AH). The basic format used for this NC*AH publication was adapted for the field report assigned to participants.

TABLE II

Reported Frequency of Integrations with Art

Site	Social Studies (total integ. = 60)					Math (total integ. = 56)					Science (total integ. = 51)					Reading (total integ. = 54)				
	*N	On.	2x	2-4	0	N	On.	2x	2-4	0	N	On.	2x	2-4	0	N	On.	2x	2-4	0
Chicago:																				
Art	1	1	1		3	1		1	1	3	2				2	1	1	1		
Sp. Ed.		1	1		2	2	1		3	2				2	1			2		2
E. St. Louis																				
Art																				
Sp. Ed.	3	2	2	3	5	6	5		2	5	6	2		3	4	6			5	4
Springfield																				
Art	2	1		3	5	2			1	9	1	1	1	1	8	1	1	2	1	8
Sp. Ed.	2	3		5	2	2		2	3	3		1	2	5	2	1	1	2	2	4
Peoria																				
Art	3			5	3				2	3			1	1	4	1	1			
Sp. Ed.	4	4		4	5	5	3	1	4	4	5	3	1	2	6	4	2	2	5	4
TOTAL	15	12	4	19	25	21	9	4	14	29	17	6	4	14	27	17	9	8	15	22

* Code: N=Never; On.=Once a week; 2x=two times a week; 2-4=two to four times a week; O=Other.

Most material covered in the workshop was accompanied by written handouts. By providing this additional instructional material, participants were able to concentrate on key concepts, without the pressure of taking extensive notes.

4 Outline of Instruction. The following outline includes the content covered during workshop segments:

a. Definitions of terms specific to various handicapping conditions: i.e., deaf, hard of hearing, sign, fingerspelling, blind, partially seeing, braille, etc.
   1. lecture with overhead projector
   2. group activity
   3. group discussion

b. Characteristics of each handicapping condition and implications for teaching/learning.
   1. videotapes
   2. individual activity
   3. group discussion

c. Individualization of concept presentations, materials and projects in a group situation.
   1. lecture
   2. videotape
   3. group discussion

d. Ways of integrating art in academic subjects to facilitate concept learning.
   1. Discussion of key concepts in math.
      a. pre-number activities
      b. counting
      c. verbal problem-solving
      d. measurement and proportion
   2. Discussion and slide presentation of ways to reinforce these math concepts through specific art experiences.
   3. Discussion of key concepts in science.
      a. scientific inquiry (discovery approach)
      b. communication
      c. observation
   4. Discussion and slide presentation of ways to reinforce these scientific concepts through specific art experiences.
   5. Discussion of key concepts in reading.
      a. left to right progression
      b. visual discrimination
      c. visualization
      d. vocabulary development
   6. Discussion and slide presentation of ways to reinforce these reading concepts through specific art experiences.
   7. Discussion of key concepts in social studies.
      a. family
      b. neighborhood
      c. community

8. Discussion and slide presentation of ways to reinforce these social studies concepts through specific art experiences.

e. Specific ways of adapting art materials, methods and media for a variety of handicapped children.
   1. slide lecture
   2. group discussion

f. Classroom management issues: problems and solutions for the art learning situation.
   1. presentation of selected case studies representing a cross-section of problems usually encountered
   2. small group discussion and planning
   3. feedback and large group discussion

B. Implementation

1. Site Location for Workshops. In Chicago a centrally located site was sought to accommodate both the city and the suburban populations. Oakbrook Terrace was selected in that it is located near several interstate highways and was central to persons travelling from the city as well as those commuting from the northern and southern suburbs. (Stella May Swartz School, art room, 16th street, Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois.)

   In East St. Louis the workshop was held in the art room of the E. St. Louis High School.

   The Illinois State University College of Continuing Education assisted in locating the workshop site in Springfield (U. S. Grant Middle School). Because potential sites in the Peoria area required fees, the workshop site was shifted to the Illinois Soldier's and Sailor's Childrens' Home in Normal, Illinois. Since the Peoria workshop included participants from a distance of 60 miles, the shift did not pose any major problems (most participants originally having to travel some distance).

   At the Chicago site there were two rooms for the workshop, a large art room and a room for lecture/discussion and viewing of slides and videotapes. At each of the other sites there were three rooms available for the workshop. The additional room permitted the spreading-out of two of the art learning stations and eliminated crowded conditions experienced in Chicago (where some of the art activities overflowed into the hallway).

2. Selection of Participants. Four methods were used to select participants.

   a. The Regional Directors of Special Education and/or Special Education Administrators in the four site areas were contacted for nominations and alternates in accordance with the established breakdown of the in-service special education teachers described in Figure 1. These teachers were then contacted directly and invited to participate.

b. Those elementary art teachers listed in the 1977-78 Directory of the Illinois Art Education Association, who were located in the four site areas (or within an hour's drive of the workshop sites) were contacted and invited to participate. As specified in the proposal, no more than fifteen art teachers were selected as participants at each site. Other nominations and alternates were obtained from the site area art supervisors and art coordinators.

c. When the intended breakdown of special education and art education teachers could not be obtained for a given site (which was the case in the Peoria and E. St. Louis sites where elementary art teachers have been eliminated due to budget problems), regular elementary classroom teachers teaching special education children were invited to fill out the specified quota. These elementary classroom teachers were nominated by administrative staff at the site areas.

d. Additionally, general announcements were sent out to administrative staff in the Springfield and E. St. Louis sites. These announcements were distributed to principals for circulation to interested teachers.

Figure 1

Specified Distribution of Participants for Each Site

	Number	Total # of Handicapped Children in Classes
Visually Impaired	1	15
Hearing Impaired	2	32
Orthopedically Handicapped	2	30
Mentally Retarded	7	105
Learning Disabled	7	105
Behaviorally Disordered	6	90
Art Teachers	15	450

The final enrollment of participants by site is presented in Table III. There was some attrition of enrollment from pre-enrollment to actual participation. This attrition was increased due to inclement weather at the Peoria workshop site.

TABLE III

Art for the Handicapped Workshop Enrollment by Site

Workshop Sites:	Chicago	E. St. Louis	Springfield	Peoria
Number Enrolled				
Art	9	2	13	7
Special Ed.	17	16	23	30
Elementary Ed.	1	5	1	1
Total Number	27	23*	37	38**
Number Completing Both Segments:				
Art	7	2	12	3
Special Ed.	12	12	19	9
Elementary Ed.	0	5	1	1
Total Number	19	19	32	13

* Up until the week before the workshop only ten had pre-enrolled. Ms. Doris Cason, Art Coordinator for E. St. Louis, recruited an additional thirty-four who signed up to attend--but for a variety of reasons this was final enrollment the night of the first workshop segment.

** Inclement weather affected the enrollments at this site and only sixteen attended the first night. An attempt was made to schedule a fifth workshop. However, a survey of participants who had pre-enrolled resulted in only four affirmative responses indicating willingness to attend a rescheduled workshop.

At each workshop site there was a cross-section of participants representing classrooms of all high-incidence and most low-incidence handicapping conditions (Table IV).

A total of [illegible] teachers completed both workshop segments. The number of students enrolled in classes taught by these teachers is at least 1513.

TABLE IV

Participants Completing Workshop Segments by Teaching Specialty

Site	Total	El.Ed.	Art	EMH	TMH	LD/BD	VI	HI	OH	Reading	NC	Speech/ Lang.
Chicago	19		7	5	1	4			1		1	
Number of Students Represented	343		210	50	10	48			15		10	
E. St. Louis	19	5	2	2	2	5			1	2		
Number of Students Represented	385	150	60	20	20	60			15	60		
Springfield	32		12	4	5	6		1	1	1		2
Number of Students Represented	613		360	40	50	72		16	15	30		30
Peoria	13	1	3	4		4						
Number of Students Represented	172	30	90	40		12						

Thus, the workshop training has the potential of affecting a very large number of learners with handicapping conditions.

3. Workshops. The project goals were accomplished via a workshop format divided into two segments. The first segment of one and one-half instructional days began on a Friday evening and continued the following day. At the close of the first segment each participant was given a field assignment. After a three- to four-week period for field testing of the material covered during the first segment, a second all-day follow-up workshop was held.

   a. The first workshop segment included:

      1. Activities to facilitate communication between the participants including teaming participants in small groups which included one art and several special education teachers.

      2. Slide lecture/discussion of procedures for integrating art with the academic areas of math, science, reading and social studies.

      3. Videotape discussion of the major handicapping conditions.

      4. Small group discussion of special education terminology.

      5. "Hands-on" art activities presented in a learning center format with participants circulating through each of four centers in a composite of several of the small groups referred to in 1 above.

      6. Planning of integrated art and academic lessons based on the "hands-on" art activities, and on small group discussion using prepared worksheets as a guide.

      7. Slide lecture/discussion of a variety of ways of adapting materials and situations for learners with various handicapping conditions.

      8. Discussion of a field assignment which required participants to implement art activities and sample art/academic lessons discussed. The field report required teachers to collect visual evidence of activities accomplished accompanied by a three to five page write-up following a model developed by the National Committee * Arts for the Handicapped and modified to include visuals.

      9. Brief written evaluation by participants of the first workshop segment.

      10. Review by workshop staff of participants' written evaluations.

      11. Replanning workshop strategies as needed.

b. The second workshop segment included:

1. Videotape/lecture discussion of characteristics and educational implications of the low-incidence handicapping conditions.

2. Presentations by participants (in small groups) of the outcomes of their field assignments. Selected field assignments from each small group were then shared with the entire group.

3. Photographing of art work, presented by participants as part of their field assignments, on site.

4. Evaluation of art work.

5. Workshop staff response to field assignments, offering solutions to problems (if any) posed and encouraging further suggestions for utilization of related art activities.

6. Additional "hands-on" art activities specifically requested by participants on the first segment evaluation forms.

7. Presentation and discussion of common maladaptive behaviors in art learning situations including possible solutions for managing and/or changing these behaviors.

8. Evaluation by participants via completion of a short form covering the second segment and a long form covering the workshop series as a whole. The long form included a pre- and post-workshop questionnaire covering some of the same questions initially posed on the needs assessment, including:

   a. knowledge of artistic processes
   b. perceived appropriateness of these processes in the teacher's curriculum
   c. knowledge of special education terminology

9. Staff review of evaluations. (Afterwards the evaluations were forwarded to the outside evaluator. After review and commentary by the outside evaluator , the staff reviewed this commentary and provided their reactions to the evaluator's reactions.)

10. Replanning of strategies as needed.

4. Graduate Credit. An outline for an experimental graduate course was developed by the staff and submitted for approval through the Graduate School. This course, Art for the Handicapped (one hour of graduate credit), was approved for implementation through the I.S.U. College of Continuing Education and Public Service. The course was established so it could be cross-listed in either the Art or the

Special Education Departments, enabling participants to enroll through either department. All participants were required to enroll in both the graduate course and in the I.S.U. Graduate School. The proposal for the course to be offered on a pass-fail basis was denied due to university regulations. Thus, specific grades were assigned to the participants although initially the course had been advertised as a "pass-fail" offering.

5. Evaluation. Evaluation of the workshop segments took several forms. Outside evaluators on the project were Dr. Gordon Hoke and Ms. Shirley Kessler of the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois. Dr. Hoke and his staff were helpful in providing a "third-party" critical eye during the development of the instructional materials as well as an external reality to interpreting the participants' responses on several evaluation forms. Plans had included on-site visitation by Dr. Hoke, but bad weather prevented this event.

   Feedback information was obtained from participants at the close of each segment in the form of four open-ended questions. The workshop staff made appropriate shifts in the workshop schedule and in instructional content to accommodate participants' needs at each site. Thus the specific schedule for the second workshop segment changed from site to site according to the stated needs of the participants.

   Additionally, at the close of the second segment, a longer evaluation form was used to assess information obtained during the two and one-half days of workshop instruction. This included the same questions as the pre-workshop needs assessment about knowledge of art processes, appropriateness of these art processes to specific classroom curricula and knowledge of special education terminology. Participants' responses on the pre- and post-workshop questionnaires were compared. A mean score for each of these areas was computed (see Table V).

   A perusal of these mean scores indicates that there were increases in each area and at each site.

   Participants were also asked to write anonymous comments regarding their workshop experience. The comments generally indicated a high level of satisfaction and a feeling of accomplishment. Some made suggestions for improving the workshop. Following are some examples of comments:

   1. "I have never been involved in a more interesting or satisfying course." (A Chicago area Art teacher)
   2. "I felt the section where we shared our field assignments was most beneficial. We learned many more interesting ideas." (A Chicago area Special Education teacher)
   3. "Twenty to thirty minutes is ample time for a lecture. More time is needed for doing projects." (An E. St. Louis Special Education teacher)

TABLE V

Mean Scores of Participants' Responses on Art for the Handicapped Workshop Assessment of Knowledge of Special Education Terms and Knowledge of Art Processes and Value in Curriculum

Workshop Sites	Special Ed. Terms	Art Processes	Value in Curriculum
Chicago			
Pre-Workshop Instruction	96.60	61.20	61.40
Post-Workshop Instruction	136.12	99.62	80.75
E. St. Louis			
Pre-Workshop Instruction	83.52	43.66	58.85
Post-Workshop Instruction	95.64	76.14	68.00
Springfield			
Pre-Workshop Instruction	102.03	63.66	64.73
Post-Workshop Instruction	121.82	100.17	86.24
Peoria			
Pre-Workshop Instruction	90.56	55.70	62.90
Post-Workshop Instruction	120.61	96.38	83.69

-17-

4. "Actually doing a project gives you a much better idea of whether or not your student could do it. It also gives you the knowledge necessary to teach it and incentive to do so." (A Peoria area Special Education teacher of the Educable Mentally Handicapped)
5. "Many of the handouts were excellent and I could probably use them if and when I have to give an in-service or attend one for my teaching area." (A Chicago area Special Education teacher of the Educable Mentally Handicapped)
6. "I especially liked the special terminology section. As an art teacher many of these were strunge." (A Springfield area Art teacher)
7. "The art teachers were very helpful in solving 'how-to' problems." (A Peoria area Special Education teacher of the Educable Mentally Handicapped)
8. "No hands-on during lunch!" (A Springfield Special Education teacher)
9. "I learn most by interaction and discussion with my colleagues. Get great ideas--share joys--glad to know others have same kinds of problems I do." (A Peoria area Special Education teacher of the Learning Disabled)
10. "I'm taking Art for the Handicapped at (name deleted) University, and your program in one day has covered more than the entire quarter. However, the (name deleted) University course is worth 3 hours credit and yours is worth a great deal more!" (An E. St. Louis Art teacher)
11. "The workshop was supercalafragelisticexpialidoshious!" (An E. St. Louis Elementary Education teacher)
12. "I have enjoyed being here (even with all the snow) and have felt the information has been invaluable for working with special children." (A Peoria area Special Education teacher of the Learning Disabled and Educable Mentally Handicapped)
13. "I had some doubts about the use of art in relation to reading handicaps. I am now quite excited and want to try a few things." (A Reading teacher)
14. "I felt the workshop was excellent; it is much more motivating to teach with art rather than do straight drill work." (A Springfield area teacher of the Learning Disabled/Behavior Disordered)
15. "...(I was able) to learn how art activities can support my curriculum, reinforce it." (A Special Education teacher of the Learning Disabled/Behavior Disordered)
16. "I thoroughly enjoyed this workshop. I am more motivated to do more art activities now. I have a better idea of some easy-to-do projects that my students could handle." (A Springfield Special Education teacher of the Orthopedically Handicapped and Educable Mentally Retarded)
17. "I thoroughly enjoyed the workshop and being involved in the classroom project--and so did my class." (A Peoria area Elementary Education teacher)
18. "The adaptations of art activities really helped to focus better on the handicapping conditions...the slides made it much easier to visualize these helpful suggestions, than just reading about them." (A Springfield area Bilingual teacher)
19. "Best workshop I've ever attended. Where were you before?!" (A Springfield area Art teacher)

20. "It's been a good experience. I've learned many things that I can take back to my classroom and use and it's been fun." (A Peoria area Special Education teacher of the Learning Disabled)
21. "I did not like all the paperwork in registering." (A Springfield area Art teacher)
22. "It all jelled together to form a most satisfactory experience. It was most helpful to meet and discuss issues with special education teachers." (A Springfield area Art teacher)
23. "I enjoyed the workshop--I feel like I am coming away with more confidence in my ability to teach art. (A Chicago area Special Education teacher of the Trainable Mentally Handicapped)
24. "Most useful were the art projects, discussions with other teachers and the handouts--especially the bibliography--to know where to go for help." (A Springfield area Art teacher)
25. "Thoroughly enjoyed the class and have a lot of new ideas and a new appreciation of the handicapped person." (A Peoria area Art teacher)

An evaluation statement by the outside evaluators follows this report (see Appendix).

There was a low attrition rate at each workshop and over 80% of the participants returned for the second workshop segment. Ninety-eight percent completed both parts of the field assignment. Only three failed to turn in written reports and only two failed to bring visual evidence of their own classroom implementation (one of these participants was an administrator who does not have access to students in a classroom situation). The highest attrition rate occurred at the Peoria workshop site, undoubtedly due to the inclement weather.

The visual evidence of each participant's field assignment was examined and a photographic record was made. In 98% of the cases, it was apparent that the participants had successfully completed at least one integrated art/academic lesson. The criteria for this evaluation was based on a comparison of the examples presented with what typically is expected for similar children of the same age. In over 25% of the cases, the participants brought in two or more examples of student projects indicating that several different art/academic lessons had been completed during the three- to four-week period of implementation.

This visual evidence was buttressed by the participants' written and oral reports. Without exception, the written reports indicated a knowledge of the processes of integrating art with the other academic areas, and documented a successful field test of the process with one or more special students. The participants' positive verbal reports underscored this success. Additionally, participants were eager to share the results of their implementation, and, in E. St. Louis, they insisted that every participant report back to the entire group (initially this report was slated for a small group which then would select one or two reports which would be shared with the whole group).

One additional index of the successful completion of the field assignment was the number of problems encountered by the participants during the implementation period. The workshop schedule for the second segment provided a period of time for the workshop staff to respond to such

problems. Only in one instance (at the Peoria workshop) was a problem reported. This occurred during one (of several) integrated art and reading session where the participant had attempted an adaptation of a puzzle idea. In her situation the adaptation was not successful for the specific learner. The same participant, however, successfully completed five other separate and distinct art activities based on the workshop content during the 4 week field implementation period. It is significant that of the 83 participants at the four workshop sites, there was only this one reported problem with the field assignment.

V. Implications

Based on the evaluation of the workshop series, it appears that the training model is viable. Among other factors, the following appear to be key ingredients in the model:

1. Workshop instruction was based on data collection from identified participants.

2. Workshop instruction was conducted "in the field" at different geographic locations.

3. Workshop instruction had a built-in field-testing component which facilitated implementation of content and skills acquired during the first instructional workshop segment. Participants not only were encouraged to field-test methods of integrating art and other academic learning, they reported on this field test both in verbal and in written form. Additionally, since participants were all enrolled in a graduate course as a part of the workshop, they had added incentive to field-test and to report their results.

4. Workshop instruction had a built-in "follow-up" component. The workshop model provided a three- to four-week period for implementation after which additional instruction was given.

5. The workshop staff not only was willing to face the consequences of an assigned implementation, they also considered the implementation an integral part of the workshop concept. The staff planned to be accountable for problems which participants might encounter in field-testing the material.

It is apparent that the interest level remained high throughout the training sessions. Participants were willing to attend without renumeration. Moreover, the material covered was implemented with a high level of success. Participants were able to absorb a great deal of information, improving their skill levels and knowledge of art processes and special education terminology. A good rapport developed among the participants and an increased empathy for one another's discipline was evident from the beginning when participants were teamed into groups representing in microcosm the make-up of the larger group. The evidence underlines the conclusion that workshops of this type represent viable in-service training programs that should be continued.

VI. Dissemination

Information about the project has been and is being disseminated through several channels. A final workshop publication in the form of a monograph is in press. This monograph, which includes 25-30 photographs, includes an overview of the project and 26 selected field reports with visual evidence. These field reports represent a cross-section of teaching areas and describe art work of students with a variety of handicapping conditions from each of the four workshop sites. This monograph will be forwarded to all workshop participants and their administrators. Announcements about the monograph have appeared in the June, 1979, Illinois Art Education Association Newsletter and have been submitted to the National Art Education Association Newsletter for inclusion at the earliest possible date. It is anticipated that other copies will be distributed through the National Committee * Arts for the Handicapped.

A. Conferences. Reports about the project have been made at the following professional meetings: Dr. Frances E. Anderson gave a brief overview of the project during the 23rd World Congress of the International Society for Education Through the Arts, Adelaide, Australia, in August, 1978.

A panel presentation was made at the April, 1979, National Art Education Association meeting in San Francisco. This session, although scheduled at the end of the week-long meeting (in the early morning) drew a standing-room-only crowd. The capacity crowd reflected the strong interest in the topic. A special preliminary grant report was prepared for this meeting and 75 copies were distributed to the conferees. (see Appendix) Additionally, a 25 minute slide/tape show, including slides of the workshop activities, participants and field report visuals, was prepared and presented. Since this presentation there have been several letters of inquiry about the project based on the strength of its listing in the conference program. Additionally, at this same meeting Dr. Anderson was one of two on a panel presentation moderated by Wendy Perks of the National Committee * Arts for the Handicapped. During this presentation information was shared about the project and 20 copies of the preliminary grant report were distributed. (Additional copies were requested but no more were available.) The few remaining copies (c. 20) were distributed by Ms. Pat McAnally at the Dallas meeting of the Council on Exceptional Children the following week.

Dr. Frances E. Anderson keynoted the May, 1979, Missouri Spring Art Educators meeting in Columbia, Missouri. A part of her presentation included a report on some of the outcomes of the project.

Information was also disseminated by Dr. Anderson at the May meeting of the Illinois Art Therapy Association in Chicago.

Other dissemination is planned for the American Art Therapy Association National Conference in Washington, D.C. in November, 1980; the National Art Education Association meeting in April, 1980, in Atlanta; and the Council on Exceptional Children's national meeting in Philadelphia in April, 1980. Copies of the grant monograph will be distributed at these three meetings.

VII. Limitations

This project was limited by several factors. Budgetary constraints limited the project to a possible maximum of 30 participants in each of four geographic areas in the State of Illinois. Of this number at each site, a maximum of 15 were elementary art teachers and the rest were special education teachers. An attempt was made to have a representation of the major specialties within art and special education. Table IV presented the final distribution of teachers.

This type of training necessitates a staff/student ratio of not more than one to six. In two workshops it was obvious that there was a need for a fourth staff person and in two instances an additional staff person volunteered to assist.

Inclement weather was a limiting factor and seriously affected enrollments at the Peoria workshop. Additionally, it was difficult to locate centrally positioned classroom space that was available at no charge to the project.

The complicated graduate course enrollment procedures required by the university were limitations. Attempts to simplify this process were unsuccessful.

The scheduling of the workshop segments over weekends was a potential limiting factor. It would have helped to provide stipends and/or monies for substitutes so that the workshop segments could have been held during the regular school day.

Budgetary restraints seriously limited the funds available for dissemination efforts. There were few funds available from internal sources for travel (none from the I.S.U. Art Department).

The amount of released time for staff to work on the project was a limitation. In fact, the project had to be extended for two additional months (with no additional funding) and the final grant publication will not be off the press for three to four months, with distribution occurring after that time. More staff released time for work on a project of this type would have been more appropriate to the tasks that had to be accomplished.

Finally, having only one half-time secretary on the project was a serious limitation. Projects of this kind require extensive secretarial assistance.

These aforementioned problem issues are intended to provide a base for planners of similar projects in the future. It is obvious that a successful project can be attained in the presence of these factors, but with great difficulty.

July 28, 1979

References

Anderson, Frances E. Art for All the Children: A Creative Sourcebook for the Impaired Child. Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, IL., 1978.

Anderson, Frances E. "Mainstreaming Art as Well as Children," Art Education, December, 1975, Vol. 28, No. 8.

Anderson, Frances E. "The Changing Role of the Art Education Professor," Art Education, April, 1976, Vol. 19, No. 4.

Anderson, Frances E. and Larry S. Barnfield. "Art Especially for the Exceptional," Art Education, April-May, 1974, Vol. 27, No. 4 & 5.

National Art Education Association, Art Education, Dec., 1975, Vol, 28, No. 8, entire issue.

Quinn, T. and C. Hanks (Eds). Coming to our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education; A Panel Report. J. D. Rockefeller, Jr., Chairman; The Arts Education and Americans Panel. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Rubin, Judith A. "Art is for All Human Beings--Especially the Handicapped," Art Education, Dec., 1975, Vol. 28, No. 3.

Stake, Robert. Evaluating the Arts in Education: A Responsive Approach. Charles Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, 1975.

Williams, Roger M. "Why Children Should Draw - The Surprising Link Between Art and Learning," Saturday Review, September 3, 1977.

APPENDIX

Outside Evaluator's Statement

Introduction

In our planning sessions with members of the project team, Summer and early Fall, 1978, we emphasized the possibility of two major constraints: (1) belated return of the needs assessment and (2) participant resistance to sessions occurring Friday evening and Saturdays. Although both conditions emerged as the project evolved, they were not crippling influences.

The remarks below are divided into three categories: Administrative, Program and Future implications.

Administrative

Comments from participants indicated that art people wanted "additional information on dealing with special kids and the special education people wanted more on the arts experience." While the positive results obtained in the workshops by combining disparate groups should be noted and used in future planning, the comments also indicate the possibility of successfully conducting two separate workshops: one for special education teachers to spend a greater period of time on art experiences and one for the arts people to learn more about special children..

Program

The comments by participants at all sessions were very favorable, in large part because of the "hands-on" experiences.

Future Implications

Because this program was conducted as a pilot program, we have chosen to offer several recommendations about future activities.

1. Participants should be asked to report the extent to which they were able to use the information and activities presented in the workshops. This could be made a part of the field reports.

2. It may be that the setting in which the workshop is conducted -- e.g., public schools, lab schools, private facilities, etc. -- can influence the behavior of participants and the value of the workshop to the participants.

3. The activities and discussions where a cross section of teachers were involved proved extremely valuable and the possibility of planning for this type of interaction during a greater portion of time in future workshops should be considered.

4. The graduate credit offered for participation in the course should be examined to determine whether the credit is important to and/or necessary for the participants.

Finally, we applaud the idea of an interdisciplinary team approach, so clearly portrayed in the proposal, and praise the creative, unstinting efforts of its members to operationalize an extremely difficult plan. Professors Anderson, McAnally and Colchado deserve congratulations.

Gordon Hoke

Associate Professor
College of Education
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation (CIRCE)
University of Illinois

APPENDIX

Illinois State University

Departments of Art and Special Education

ART FOR THE HANDICAPPED - Workshop Needs Assessment - 1978-79

Indicate your Geographical area_____

Name_____Teaching Area: ___Art; ___El. Ed.;

___Special Ed. Specify student handicapping conditions:_____

_____Ages_____

To help us plan our workshop segments we need to have some information from you, the participants. Please read the questions carefully and give considered thought to your responses. We thank you for your time in responding to our questions. Please return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided AS SOON AS POSSIBLE to insure a place in the workshop. All other details relating to your enrollment in the I.S.U. graduate course, ART FOR THE HANDICAPPED (389.36) (one hour on a pass/fail basis--fees paid by the grant) will be handled during the first workshop segment (Friday evening). A letter accompanies this needs assessment with details about the times and location of the workshop.

Complete all parts and return within 7 days.

ART INFORMATION. Please place a check in the appropriate response on BOTH SIDES of the item.

I can teach it to others	I can do this activity or I can make the project.	I have seen this done, but have never done it myself.	I do not know how to do this activity.	Art Materials and Processes	Very Important (would fit in well with my regular curriculum)	Moderately Important (could be adapted to my curriculum)	Mildly Important (could be done as "extra interest" project)	Not Important (not really appropriate for my curriculum)
				1. PRINTMAKING				
				A. Monoprinting				
				B. Found object printmaking				
				C. String on wood printmaking				
				D. Cardboard printmaking				
				E. Collograph printmaking				

© Developmental Copyright, 1978, Anderson, McAnally, Morreau

I can teach it to others.	I can do this activity or I can make the project.	I have seen this done, but have never done it myself.	I do NOT know how to do this activity.		Very important (would fit in well with my regular curriculum)	Moderately Important (could be adapted to my curriculum)	Mildly Important (could be done as "extra interest" project)	Not important (not really appropriate for my curriculum
				F. Meat tray printmaking				
				G. Tissue paper printing				
				2. PUPPETRY				
				A. Yarn puppets				
				B. Sock puppets				
				C. Sack puppets				
				D. Finger puppets				
				E. Spoon puppets				
				F. Egg carton puppets				
				3. THREE DIMENSIONAL CONSTRUCTION				
				A. Wood Sculpture				
				B. Box sculpture				
				C. Newspaper sculpture				
				D. Slotted cardboard sculpture				
				E. Styrofoam packing material sculpture				
				F. Nail relief				

					Very Important (would fit in well with my regular curriculum)	Moderately Important (could be adapted to my curriculum)	Mildly Important (could be done as "extra interest" project)	Not Important (not really appropriate for my curriculum)
I can teach it to others.	I can do this activity or I can make the project.	I have seen this done, but have never done it myself.	I do NOT know how to do this activity.					
				G. Geoboard				
				H. Coat hanger sculpture				
				4. OTHER A. Slide making				
				B. Marbelized paper				
				C. Paper towel fold and dye				
				D. Wax paper and melted crayon pictures				
				E. Marker drawing on foil				
				F. Nature weaving				
				G. Folded paper animals				

II. Are any of the following situations a problem for you?

1. In my mainstreamed classroom, the handicapped children are behind in their art skills (ability to use scissors, for example), and their figure concepts. I therefore cannot plan the same activity for them that I plan for the rest of my class. (Check appropriate response)

___Yes, this is a problem.
___No, this is not a problem.
___Does not apply.

2. In my art class, my non-impaired students do not easily socialize, make friends, discuss or interact with my handicapped students. (Check appropriate response)

___Yes, this is a problem.
___No, this is not a problem.
___Does not apply

3. In my art class, my handicapped students do not respond to the same classroom management approach I use with the non-impaired students, but I cannot have two different sets of rules for the same class members. (Check appropriate response)

___Yes, this is a problem.
___No, this is not a problem.
___Does not apply.

III. We need to know what problems (if any) you might be having in teaching art to children with handicaps. Please list your three most pressing problems (the first is the greatest problem). Be specific as to situation, etc.

1. (greatest problem)

2. (next most pressing problem)

3. (third most pressing problem)

Explain any other problems you might be having:

Please check the column that best indicates your level of understanding of the following terms:

don't know	know in context	know and use	could explain to others	
				learning disabilities
				perserveration
				reversals
				hyperactive
				educable mentally retarded
				deaf
				hard of hearing
				residual hearing
				speechreading
				manual communication
				total communication
				blind
				partially seeing
				braille
				residual vision
				strabismus
				nystagmus
				myopia
				hyperopia
				astigmatism

don't know	know in context	know and use	could explain to others	
				orthopedically impaired
				cerebral palsy
				spasticity
				athetosis
				epilepsy
				grand mal
				petit mal
				hemophilia
				behavior disorders
				behavior modification
				shaping
				modeling
				reinforcing
				acting out
				task analysis
				autism
				hypoactive
				Individual Educational Plan (IEP)

There is no general agreement as to conditions for placement of children with handicapping conditions in art or in a regular classroom situation. Thus we would like your impressions and reactions to the following items. Please check BOTH SIDES of the response options for each handicapping condition listed below.

Very receptive to having child in regular class	Usually receptive to having child in regular class	I would not be receptive to having this child in regular class		No restrictions for enrolling this child in my class	Would enroll child with aide available in class to help	Not appropriate to have this child in my class.
			Visually Impaired Child			
			Hearing Impaired Child			
			Learning Disabled Child			
			Behaviorally Disordered Child			
			Orthopedically Handicapped Child			
			Mentally Retarded Child			

I have worked with children with these types of handicapping conditions: (please check BOTH ITEMS)

	YES I have taught	NO I have not taught	Severity of Handicapping Condition		
			Mild	Moderate	Severe
Visually Impaired Child					
Hearing Impaired Child					
Learning Disabled Child					
Behaviorally Disordered Child					
Orthopedically Handicapped Child					
Mentally Retarded Child					

What was the greatest problem you encountered in working with children with the following handicapping conditions?

1. Hearing Impaired: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)_____

2. Learning Disabled: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)_____

3. Visually Impaired: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)_____

4. Behaviorally Disordered: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)__

5. Orthopedically Impaired: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)__

6. Mentally Retarded: (Greatest Problem--please be specific.)_____

ART FOR THE HANDICAPPED WORKSHOP NEEDS ASSESSMENT

NAME_____; I teach: Art___ Special Ed.___ Elem. Ed.___
(last) (first)

I have the following art materials for my students:
check appropriate response:

	Have in Classroom	Can get
Tempera paint		
Paint brushes		
White drawing paper		
Crayons		
Water color markers		
Scissors		
White glue		
Pencils		
Masking tape		
Brayers		
Waterbase printers ink		
Acetate		
Slide mounts (old file folders		
Cardboard		
Wax paper		
Old magazines		
Coat hangers		
Display area		
Tissue paper		

	Have in Classroom	Can get
Construction paper		
Stapler		
Water containers (i.e. pie tins)		
Yarn		
Wood		
Nails		
Newspapers		
Old boxes		
Styrofoam packing		
Aluminum foil		
Ditto paper		
Iron		
Pliers		
Needle and thread		
Cloth scraps		
Food coloring		
Storage for 3-d projects		

On the average, how much time do you spend teaching art each week:

___30 min. ___30-60 min. ___over 60 min. ____Other: specify

How often do you integrate art with Social Studies?

___never thought about it ___once a week ___2 times a week ___2-4 times a month ___other: specify

How often do you integrate art with Math? ___never thought about it ___once a week ___2 times a week ___2-4 times a month ___other: specify

How often do you integrate art with Science? ___never thought about it ___once a week ___2 times a week ___2-4 times a month ___other: specify

How often do you integrate art with Reading? ___never thought about it ___once a week ___2 times a week ___2-4 times a month ___other: specify

Return to: Art Department, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois 61761